



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/730,288

12/09/2003

Jin-oh Yang

45916

2598

7590

10/19/2004

Christian C. Michel
Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.
Suite 600
1300 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

EXAMINER

DINH, JACK

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2873

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/730,288	Applicant(s) YANG, JIN-OH	
	Examiner Jack Dinh	Art Unit 2873	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>DETAILED ACTION</u> . |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicant's submitted prior art in view of Deguchi et al. (US Patent 4,609,267).

(a) Regarding claims 1, 6 and 13, the Applicant's submitted prior art is interpreted as disclosing a camera including a zoom lens optical system including a junction lens device made by joining a high refractive lens and a low refractive lens using an adhesive (paragraphs 0003 & 0004). The Applicant's submitted prior art discloses all the claimed limitations except for a coating layer formed between the adhesive and one of the lens surfaces to reduce a reflection ratio on the junction surface. Within the same field of endeavor, Deguchi is interpreted as disclosing the teaching of an antireflection layer disposed between two layers of different refractive indices (col. 2, lines 40-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the coating layer, as taught by Deguchi, for the purpose of minimizing glares at the junction surface.

Art Unit: 2873

(b) Regarding claims 4, 10 and 17, the Applicant's submitted prior art is interpreted as disclosing zoom lens optical system including a junction lens device made by joining a high refractive lens and a low refractive lens using an adhesive (paragraphs 0003 & 0004). The Applicant's submitted prior art discloses all the claimed limitations except for a coating layer formed between the adhesive and one of the lens surfaces to reduce a reflection ratio on the junction surface so the reflection ratio is not more than about 0.2%. Within the same field of endeavor, Deguchi is interpreted as disclosing the teaching of an antireflection layer disposed between two layers of different refractive indices (col. 2, lines 40-50). In addition, such range of reflection ratio would have been within the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art given the teaching of Deguchi, and can be found through experimentation. It is considered not inventive to discover the optimum range by routine experimentation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the coating layer and such reflection ratio range, as taught by Deguchi, for the purpose of minimizing glares at the junction surface and selecting a preferred optimum range for the reflective ratio.

(c) Regarding claims 2, 7, 14, the Applicant's submitted prior art in view of Deguchi is interpreted as disclosing all the claimed limitations, as described above, except that the reflection ratio is not more than about 0.2%. However, such range of reflection ratio would have been within the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art given the teaching of Deguchi, and can be found through experimentation. It is considered not inventive to discover the optimum range by routine experimentation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 2873

art at the time the invention was made to provide such reflection ratio range for the purpose of selecting a preferred optimum range for the reflective ratio.

(d) Regarding claims 3, 5, 8, 11, 15, 18, the Applicant's submitted prior art in view of Deguchi is interpreted as disclosing all the claimed limitations, as described above, except that difference in refractive index between the two lenses is not less than about 0.15. However, such range would have been well within the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide such range for the purpose of selecting a preferred refractive index for each lens.

(e) Regarding claims 9, 12, 16 and 19, the Applicant's submitted prior art is interpreted as further disclosing that the junction lens device is used as a front lens of a zoom lens optical system (paragraph 0005).

Conclusion

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jack Dinh whose telephone number is 571-272-2327. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30 AM - 6:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Georgia Y Epps can be reached on 571-272-2328. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2873

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jack Dinh



Georgia Epps
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800